UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,129	02/11/2004	Kenji Sakamoto	010755.53231US	2463
23911 CROWELL & I	7590 04/13/200 MORING LLP	EXAMINER		
	AL PROPERTY GROU	ZARE, SCOTT A		
P.O. BOX 1430 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20044-4300	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3687	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/775,129	SAKAMOTO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SCOTT A. ZARE	3687	

	SCOTT A. ZARE	3687	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with an appearance.</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11		otou olaimo.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-7</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u></li> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but</li> </ol>		•	
	acconstruct place the application in	CONCINUITION ANDWAIN	oo booause.
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Matthew S Gart/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3687			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 7 to recite "when ID information is subsequently detected simultaneously in a pair of ID tags, the parameter adjusting means increases the value of the parameter stored in the parameter storage means." A similar "parameter increasing step" is now recited in claim 7. However, such a step of increasing the value of the parameter based on simultaneous detection is a new feature which has yet to be considered by the Examiner. This would require a further search by an the Examiner. However, a brief review of the newly submitted claim and the prior art reveals that the amendment would overcome the prior art if it was recited in method form and required ONLY newly setting and ONLY adjusting the parameter when ID information is detected simultaneously. It remains unclear how much weight should be given to the limitations following "for" and "wherein" in the system claim, as apparatus claims are directed toward what a system is, not what a system does.